

Appln No. 09/575,150
Amdt. Dated February 23, 2004
Response to Office action of December 31, 2003

8

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, and 17 have been amended, and claim 6 has been cancelled. Therefore claims 1-5 and 7-17 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Eldridge et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,988). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 1 and 9, the Examiner states that Eldridge discloses “creating, at the first server (see col. 4, lines 6-14), an authorization record authorizing the network terminal to print at the printer; (see col. 5, lines 26-42)”. First, Eldridge does not disclose a first server at col. 4, lines 6-14; rather those lines only discuss examples of document-related activities. Regarding the second specific citation to Eldridge, it appears that the Examiner intended to refer to the full paragraph at col. 5, lines 29-45. However, that paragraph only summarizes the elements shown in Fig. 1 of Eldridge. Neither Fig. 1 nor the text cited by the examiner discloses or suggests “creating, at the first server, an authorization record authorizing the network terminal to print at the printer.” Further, nowhere else in Eldridge is there suggested a server-maintained authorization record that is specific to a network terminal that grants access to a printer. →

Nevertheless, to further clarify the function of the authorization record according to the present invention, the present amendment incorporates some of the limitations from original claim 6 into independent claim 1. Specifically, amended claim 1 now includes the additional sub-step of storing, in the authorization record, a printer identifier identifying the printer. Regarding claim 6, the Examiner stated that the above sub-step is disclosed in Eldridge at col. 6, lines 1-5. However, those lines of Eldridge refer only to a token that “is incorporated as a parameter of a token identifying the print service.” Those lines do not disclose a server-maintained authorization record that grants a terminal access to a specific printer, as per the present amended claim 1. Instead the Examiner appears to equate the token of Eldridge with the server-maintained authorization record of the presently amended claim 1. However the applicant respectfully asserts that that is not a reasonable analogy.

Appin No. 09/575,150
Amdt. Dated February 23, 2004
Response to Office action of December 31, 2003

9

Even if one were to accept for the sake of argument that the "service tokens" of Eldridge are analogous to the printing requests of the present invention (and applicant disagrees with such an analogy), Eldridge still does not disclose an authorization record that grants a terminal access to a specific printer. Eldridge does disclose an authorizer identifier (342) (see col. 7, lines 1-16) and an authorizer public key (which together are necessary and sufficient to verify an authorizer's digital signature (344) contained in a service token). But these elements together are not analogous to an authorization record that includes a printer identifier that identifies a specific printer, as defined in the present amended claim 1.

Support for the above-described limitation is found in the specification at page 50, lines 18-27, where the authorization record is referred to as a Web terminal record 809: "A preferred embodiment of a Web terminal printing protocol is shown in Figure 52. According to the protocol, whenever the Web terminal 75 wishes to print on the printer 601, it sends the printer's designated netpage formatting server 77 a request containing the URI of the document to be printed, together with the terminal ID 68. It attaches a digital signature 418 to the request, created using the Web terminal's private signature key 96. On receipt of the request and before acting on it, the formatting server verifies, via the registration server 11, that the terminal is authorized to print on the specified printer. The registration server verifies, via the Web terminal record 809 in the registration server database, that the terminal is authorized to print to the printer, and verifies the digital signature using the terminal's public key 95."


Appln No. 09/575,150
Amdt. Dated February 23, 2004
Response to Office action of December 31, 2003

10

Conclusion

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate some of the limitations of original claim 6. Based on the arguments given above, the Examiner's rejections of both original claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102 are respectfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,



PAUL LAPSTUN

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762